



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

LORENZO JUSTIN RAMSEY, §  
Plaintiff, §  
§  
vs. § Civil Action No. 3:23-05537-MGL  
§  
ANGELA R. TAYLOR, LISA KEE, TREVOR §  
C. BROWN, CAMERON P. PRESCOTT, §  
STEVEN B. SUCHOMSKI, LACEY §  
KRUSESKI, ZENDOLYN S. GREEN, §  
THELMA SALTERS, JOHN KEFFER, §  
LAUREN TAYLOR STUKES, CHARLES §  
BLAIR, and RALPH W. CANTY, §  
Defendants. §

---

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
AND SUMMARILY DISMISSING CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE  
AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS**

---

Plaintiff Lorenzo Justin Ramsey (Ramsey), proceeding pro se, filed this amended complaint against the above-named Defendants.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending this Court summarily dismiss this case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo

determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on November 17, 2023. Ramsey filed his objections on November 29, 2023. The Court has reviewed the objections, but holds them to be without merit. It will therefore enter judgment accordingly.

Ramsey appears to object to the Magistrate Judge's determination he has failed to state a basis for this Court's subject matter jurisdiction. He contends his Fourteenth Amendment rights to parent and to privacy have been violated.

Yet, he still fails to provide any facts about the named defendants that would explain how they allegedly violated these rights and what relief he seeks from them. Accordingly, he has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. The Court will thus overrule this objection.

The remainder of Ramsey's objections are nonspecific and conclusory.

This Court need not conduct a de novo review of the record "when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the [Magistrate Judge's] proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982).

Nevertheless, in an abundance of caution, the Court has reviewed the record de novo. The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's treatment of Ramsey's complaint in her well-written and comprehensive Report.

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court overrules Ramsey's objections, adopts the Report, and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court this case is summarily **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 6th day of March 2024, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis  
MARY GEIGER LEWIS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.